UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.:

П	FSI	IS	GO	N7	ΔT	F7
JI	-		\ I\ /	N / //	¬ ı,	

Plaintiff,

v.

ORION COLONIAL PLAZA LLC.

Defendants.	

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez, by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby sues Defendant, Orion Colonial Plaza, LLC, for injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§12181-12189 of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and 28 C.F.R. Part 36 and alleges:

- 1. This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") 42 U.S.C. §§12181-12189. This Court is vested with original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 2. Venue is proper in the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) in that all events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred within the Southern District of Florida and the subject premises is located within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 3. Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez ("Plaintiff") is an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA, and a resident of Miami-Dade County, Florida, and otherwise *sui juris*.
- 4. Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez ("Plaintiff") has a "qualified disability" under the ADA as he is disabled with neuropathy and nerve damage due to radiation and utilizes a

wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff's disability is defined in 42 U.S.C. §12102(1)(A)(2), 28 C.F.R. §36.105(b)(2) and 28 C.F.R. §36.105(2)(iii)(D).

- 5. Plaintiff is also an advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons, and a "tester" for the purpose of asserting his civil right, and to determine whether public accommodations are in compliance with the ADA/ADAAG.
- 6. Defendant, Orion Colonial Plaza, LLC, is a Florida limited liability Company, authorized to conduct, and conducting business within the State of Florida, which upon information and belief owns and/or operates a commercial real property identified as Folio: 33-5022-054-0010, with the post address of 13605 S. Dixie Highway, Palmetto Bay, Florida 33176, the subject of this action. Defendant's real property is built as a shopping center and referenced throughout as "Commercial Property" or "Orion Colonial".
- 7. Defendant's commercial property is built as a shopping center housing a myriad of different businesses including retail, dining options, and related establishments, that provides goods/services to the general public. As such, a "Public Accommodation" within meaning of Title III; 42 U.S.C. §12182, §12181(7) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104.
- 8. As the owner of the subject commercial property, Defendant, "Orion Colonial", and the businesses therein are open to the public, are also defined as a "Public Accommodation" within meaning of Title III 42 U.S.C. §12182, §12181(7) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104. Defendants collectively are also referred hereto as "Owners".
- 9. On or about December 28, 2023, Plaintiff personally visited the Commercial Property to inquire and/or use of the services of the tenants' businesses, and to test for compliance with the ADA/ADAAG, but because he perambulates with the assistance of a

wheelchair, and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and/or access the Commercial Property and businesses therein, (including the related parking lots and common areas), and has definite plans to return to the Commercial Property within one (1) month of the filing of this Complaint in order to avail himself of the services offered to the public at the Commercial Property, if it becomes accessible.

- 10. Due to the fact that he perambulates with the assistance of a wheelchair, Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers to access while patronizing Defendant's Commercial Property. Based on the access impediments, Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access by Defendant "Orion Colonial",
- 11. Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA, at the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at Defendant's Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property and businesses therein and likewise endangered his safety. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have accordingly posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, and others similarly situated.
- 12. Defendant owns and/or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation (the shopping center that is the subject of this Action for their violations of the ADA) that Defendant owns, and/or operates, the Commercial Property referenced above.

- 13. Plaintiff, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property, including, but not necessarily limited to the allegations in this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property and businesses therein which are open to the public and in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, but to also assure himself that this Commercial Property is in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.
- 14. Based on the access impediments Plaintiff encountered, Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access by Defendant, "Orion Colonial", owner of the commercial property.
- 15. As an investor in commercial property, Defendant, "Orion Colonial", is aware of the ADA and the need to provide for equal access within the commercial property as related to its multiple public accommodation tenants. Therefore, Defendants' failure to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities is/was willful, malicious, and oppressive and in compete disregard for the civil rights of Plaintiff and in violation of 28 C.F.R. §36.302.
- 16. Plaintiff continues to desire to patronize and/or test the commercial property, but Plaintiff continues to be injured in that he is concerned that he will again be humiliated,

segregated, and discriminated against due to the architectural barriers and other barriers to access, all which are in violation of the ADA.

- 17. Any and all requisite notice has been provided.
- 18. Plaintiff has been obligated to retain the civil rights law office of J. Courtney Cunningham, PLLC and has agreed to pay a reasonable fee for services in the prosecution of this cause, including costs and expenses incurred. Plaintiff is entitled to recover those attorney's fees, costs and expenses from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12205.

COUNT I – VIOLATIONS OF TITLE III OF THE ADA

- 19. The ADA was enacted and effective as of July 26, 1990, and ADA legislation has been protecting disabled persons from discrimination due to disabilities since that time. Over 30 years have passed since enactment of the ADA, public accommodations and places of public accommodation have had adequate time for compliance.
 - 20. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:
 - (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
 - (ii) provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and,
 - (iii) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced on a daily basis by people with disabilities.
 - 42 U.S.C. §12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).
- 21. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Plaintiff personally visited the commercial property with the intention of patronizing and/or test the public accommodation for compliance with the ADA/ADAAG; however, Plaintiff was denied adequate accommodation

because, as a disabled individual who utilizes a wheelchair for mobility, Plaintiff met barriers to access the goods and services offered at Defendants' commercial property. Therefore, Plaintiff has suffered an injury in fact.

- 22. Defendant, has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the properties the businesses thereon, in derogation of 42 U.S.C. §12101 *et seq.*, and as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. §12182 *et seq.*, by failing to remove barriers to access pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(a)(iv), where such removal is readily achievable.
- 23. Defendant, "Orion Colonial" is governed by the ADA and must comply therewith. However, Defendant has discriminated against disabled patrons in derogation of 28 C.F.R. Part 36.
- 24. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. §12134(a), on July 26, 1991 (as amended), the Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, promulgated Federal Regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA, known as the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (hereinafter "ADAAG"), 28 C.F.R. Part 36, under which said Department may obtain civil penalties of up to \$75,000 for the first violation and \$150,000 for any subsequent violation.
- 25. The commercial space which is owned/controlled by Defendant, "Orion Colonial", is in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12181 *et seq.*, the ADA and 28 C.F.R. §36.302 *et seq.*, A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Defendant's Commercial Property and businesses therein, include, but are not limited to, the following:

Panera Bread

Men's Restroom

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty opening the door without assistance, as it does not have the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door. Violation: Door does not provide the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door (53" to the wall), for doors with closers. Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff had difficulty opening the door without assistance, as it does not have the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door. Violation: Door does not provide the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door (Trash bin), for doors with closers. Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as does not provide knee clearance. Violation: Lavatory does not provide the required knee clearance above the finished floor to bottom leading edge of fixture at 8" horizontal projection. Section 4.19.2 of the ADAAG and Section 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff could not use the paper towel dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The paper towel dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.2.5 of the ADAAG and Section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

Men's Restroom - Accessible Stall

- v. The plaintiff had difficulty closing the stall door, as it is missing pull handles. Violation: Toilet compartment (stall) door does not provide pull handles on both sides of the door near the latch. Sections 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The plaintiff had difficulty closing the stall door as the toilet compartment (stall) door does not provide self-closing hinges. Sections 4.17.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as does not provide knee clearance. Violation: Lavatory does not provide the required knee clearance above the finished floor to bottom leading edge of fixture at 8" horizontal projection. Section 4.19.2 of the ADAAG and Section 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

viii. The plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory bottom supply and/or drain pipes are not fully wrapped or maintained due to the lack of maintenance violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

Service Counter

ix. The counter use to pick up food is mounted above the required height. Violation: Counter is mounted over 36" above the finished floor violating Section 7.2 of the ADAAG and Section 904.4.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

Marshalls

Men's Restroom

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, as the men's accessible restroom sign is mounted on the hinge side of the door, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as does not provide knee clearance. Violation: Lavatory does not provide the required knee clearance above the finished floor to bottom leading edge of fixture at 8" horizontal projection. Section 4.19.2 of the ADAAG and Section 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

Men's Restroom – Accessible Stall

- iii. The plaintiff could not locked stall door restroom without assistance, as the door has a non-compliant hardware. Violation: Locking door hardware, requiring grasping and turning of the wrist to operate, violating Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff had difficulty closing the stall door as the toilet compartment (stall) door does not provide self-closing hinges. Sections 4.17.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff could not use the toilet without assistance, as it flush control is mounted towards the wall side. Violation: Water closet flush control is not mounted on the open side of the water closet. Sections 4.16.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- vi. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the side wall. Violation: Water closet rear wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from centerline of the water closet to the centerline of its inner flange. Sections 4.16.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the rear wall. Violation: Water closet side wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the rear wall to the centerline of its outer flange. Sections 4.16.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the water closet does not have the required height to the top of the seat. Violation: Water closet seat is mounted at a non-compliant height above the finished floor to top. Sections 4.16.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
 - ix. The plaintiff could not use the toilet tissue dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet tissue dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.16.6 and Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
 - x. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the required clear floor space was not provided due to encroaching item (Trash can). Violation: The trash bin is encroaching over the accessible water closet clear floor space. Section 4.16.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez hereby demands judgment against Defendant, Orion Colonial Plaza, LLC, and requests the following injunctive and declaratory relief:

- a) The Court declare that Defendant have violated the ADA;
- b) The Court enter an Order directing Defendant to evaluate and neutralize itd policies, practices and procedures toward persons with disabilities,
- c) The Court enter an Order requiring Defendant to alter the commercial property and the establishment located therein such that it becomes accessible to and usable

by individuals with disabilities to the full extent required by the Title III of the ADA;

- d) The Court award reasonable costs and attorney's fees; and
- e) The Court awards any and all other relief that may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted this January 5, 2024.

By: /s/ J. Courtney Cunningham
J. Courtney Cunningham, Esq.
FBN: 628166
J. COURTNEY CUNNINGHAM, PLLC
8950 SW 74th Court, Suite 2201
Miami, Florida 33156
Telephone: 305-351-2014
cc@cunninghampllc.com
legal@cunninghampllc.com

Counsel for Plaintiff